

Application No.: 10/673,674  
Filing Date: 09/29/2003  
Office Action Dated March 21, 2006  
Amendment dated August 11, 2006  
Attorney Docket No.: C069

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

### Remarks

Claims 56, 67, 69-74, 93, and 120-133 are in the application. Claims 57-66, 68, 75-92, and 94-119 are cancelled by this amendment. Claims 120-133 are added.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 73-74, 100, 102, and 112 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for indefiniteness. Claim 70 is amended to clarify that the posting is done by the form user, that is, on the client side. Claims 73 and 74, which are dependent on claim 70, are thereby clarified. Claims 100, 102, and 112 are cancelled.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 56-75, 79, 81 and 84-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,324 to Hartman ("Hartman") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,141,666 to Tobin ("Tobin"), and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,126 to Daniels et al. ("Daniels"). Claims 76-78, 82-83, and 117-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Hartman" in view of "Tobin, and in further view of "Daniels" and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,890,175 to Wong et al. ("Wong").

Amended claim 56 includes "maintaining by the third party forms servicer a transaction state for the form so as to prevent duplicate submission or payment." Duplicate payments were a difficult problem in the field of e-commerce. Attached is an except from Philip Greenspun's Philip and Alex's Guide to Web Publishing, which describes the problem of duplicate payments. The excerpt was downloaded from the <http://philip.greenspun.com/panda/ecommerce>. Dr. Greenspun has taught at MIT's Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory since 1991 and has been involved in several technology-based companies.

The WWW uses a "stateless" protocol. That is, "[w]hen a browser (Web client) submits a request to a Web server, a connection is made between the two only long enough for the server to transmit the desired information. The server then drops the connection, and any information created by the client/server interaction is discarded by the server. The next time the client connects to the server, the slate is blank and they start that interaction from scratch."

Application No.: 10/673,674  
Filing Date: 09/29/2003  
Office Action Dated March 21, 2006  
Amendment dated August 11, 2006  
Attorney Docket No.: C069

Specification, page 30, lines 6-12. In the stateless web, it was difficult to prevent duplicate payments, because the information from the previous contact was not maintained by the server. In an example provide by Dr. Greenspun, when a user generates an order, a charge request is generated and transmitted to a payment processor, such as Cybercash. If the approval is delayed and the user gets impatient and presses "reload," an additional charge request is generated, because the stateless Web does not recall that a charged request was already generated. Page 10.

Applicants solved this problem by maintaining a state in the inherently stateless Web environment. Claim 56 recites "maintaining by the third party forms servicer a transaction state for the form so as to prevent duplicate submission or payment." By maintaining a transaction state, the problem described by Dr. Greenspun is solved. Claim 120 includes maintaining a state using hidden fields in the Web page, and claim 125 includes maintaining state information in a database table.

Claims 120 and 121 are supported on page 30, lines 20-22. Claim 122 is supported on lines 18-19. Claims 123 and 124 are support on page 30, lines 5-6. Claim 125 is supported on page 31, lines 1-2. Claims 126 and 127 are supported on page 33, lines 17-19. Claim 128 is supported on page 33, lines 8-10, and claim 129 is supported on page 33, lines 12-14. Claim 130 is supported on page 33, lines 19-21. Claim 131 is supported on page 33, lines 17-26. Claim 132 is supported on page 33, lines 10-12.

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable over the art of record and respectfully request the application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/11/06

By: 

Michael O. Scheinberg,  
Reg. No. 36,919  
P.O. Box 164140  
Austin, Texas 78716-4140  
Telephone: (512) 476-0005  
Facsimile: (512) 476-1513